

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. R. 10682. A bill to provide the equivalent of unemployment benefits for individuals inducted into the land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 10683. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 10684. A bill to define "area of production" as applied to cotton; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 10685. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 10686. A bill to extend the crediting of military service under the railroad retirement acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10693. A bill providing for the limitation of payment of salaries of certain persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Res. 635. Resolution to provide for an investigation to determine the extent to which low-rent housing projects are occupied by persons who are members of the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, or certain other organizations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 636. Resolution providing for expenses of the select committee created by House Resolution 635; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 10687. A bill authorizing Robert C. Smith to accept a decoration from the Government of Portugal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 10688. A bill for the relief of certain persons whose furniture was damaged or lost while it was being moved under a Government contract; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 10689. A bill for the relief of David Stiefel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 10690. A bill for the relief of Adolf Leon and his wife Felicia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 10691. A bill for the relief of Jacques Hailpern, Max Hailpern, and Sally Hailpern Zaharia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 10692. A bill for the relief of Isaak Silberman and his wife Sara Pearl Pauline Silberman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9382. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of members of the police department of the city of Janesville, Wis., protesting against action favorable to passage of Senate bill No. 4269 and House bill No. 10384; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9383. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the town board of the town of Mt. Pleasant, Westchester County, N. Y., unanimously opposing the establishment of a publicly or privately owned airport in the town; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9384. Also, resolution of the board of managers of the Sons of the Revolution of New York State, recommending that there be submitted to the people of the United States a constitutional

amendment forbidding Presidential tenure of office for more than two elective terms of 4 years each; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9385. By Mr. RISK: Memorial of the town council of the town of Jamestown, R. I., protesting against the proposed acquisition by the Government of the area known as Beaver-tail for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Spera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and only Saviour, Oh love that passeth knowledge, on Thee we wait at the altar of prayer. Let us all feel the deeper currents of our natures and understand their meaning and aspirations, longing for Thy refreshing grace. Shed upon our path the glow of a day of promise, the soft-ened light that beacons and cheers, quickening our devotion in the service of our country, looking unto Him who lived, walked, worked, and talked as a holy man. Heavenly Father, may we be all one in our democracy, taller in spirit and broader in mind, never forfeiting the finest ideals of life, even though rocks were melted into jewels, flowing like a golden river into our lives. We beseech Thee, O God, to free our land of the poison being injected into the arteries of our Republic. Let Christian brotherhood go deep into the throbbing centers of our city—centers where cross the crowded ways of life and Thine shall be the glory through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10543. An act to make the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws inapplicable to the lands of the Washoe County Water Conservation District, Truckee storage project, Nevada, and the Pershing County Water Conservation District, Nevada.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 658) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. B. L. Pursifull, Grace Pursifull, Eugene Pursifull, Ralph Pursifull, Bobby Pursifull, and Dora Little."

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 332

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. WILLIAM H. KING, a Senator from the State of Utah, as President of the Senate pro tempore.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House No. 1 to the bill (S. 4370) entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties"; and that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House No. 2 to said bill with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said House amendment insert the following: "The compensation of the Assistant Secretary of War shall be at the rate of \$10,000 per annum."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this is for the purpose of observing Thanksgiving Day tomorrow—

Mr. McCORMACK. I am going to follow this up with another unanimous consent request which may tend to negative the gentleman's observations.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I wish to ask the majority leader if we cannot enter into some kind of agreement to have 3-day recesses as we had before.

Mr. McCORMACK. If this unanimous-consent request is granted, I intend to follow it with another unanimous-consent request that when the House adjourns on Friday next, it adjourn to meet the following Monday.

Mr. PATMAN. And then what does the gentleman contemplate on the following Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Beyond that I am unable to advise the gentleman at this time.

Mr. PATMAN. I wonder what the minority leader would say about 3-day recesses.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Texas had better leave that in abeyance at the present time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object to adjourning over Thursday for the President's Thanksgiving Day but I take this occasion to call the attention of the House to the fact that a year ago I introduced H. R. 7556 for the purpose of settling the Thanksgiving Day controversy and making the last Thursday in November of each year the public, legal holiday for Thanksgiving in the District of Columbia and places within the jurisdiction of the United States. There are 16 States—Nevada, South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Tennessee, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Florida—that this year will observe the traditional last Thursday in November as Thanksgiving Day. A great many of these States are in the South and a great many of them are States which went Democratic in the recent election, so it is not a partisan question. It is a question which concerns the people of the country generally. Calendar makers have to make two sets of calendars according to the States in which they are to be used. College terms are upset. Family homecomings are uncertain. Federal workers observe one day—their neighbors observe another. A woman on the train the other day said in my hearing that Thanksgiving Day had lost its meaning and joy in her home because some members were free one day and some the other. Turkey growers write me that the earlier date costs them from 10 cents to a dollar a bird in less weight and uncertain marketing. The question should be faced and settled. Certainly there are other matters of importance, too, but in the absence of a settled program during the continuation of this session this resolution could be profitably considered and the question settled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday next it adjourn to meet the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the program of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War adopted at its twenty-first national convention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Hon. David E. Lilienthal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct an impression that might be created by several statements that were made on the floor of the House yesterday. One was made by my distinguished colleague and neighbor and friend the gentleman from Mississippi, in which he said:

I know you real Republicans never want to see another political mugwump take over your party and try to run it.

After this statement the word "applause" is registered. Let it be recorded that the applause came from the new dealers and not from the Republicans. We Republicans are very proud of the fine candidate we had for President and the excellent campaign he made.

I also want to call attention to a statement of another distinguished new dealer—in fact, the assistant whip of the House on the majority side, who said:

Every day this House remains in session is a vote of lack of confidence in our party leadership and an insult to the President of the United States.

I do not share that view, but I say that if the President of the United States cannot be more than a few hours away from Washington at times like these, we who are equally the people's representatives must remain on the job.

There is no logical argument that can possibly be raised in favor of an adjournment of Congress at this time. The desperate circumstances in which half of the world now finds itself must be uppermost in the minds of every American citizen. Whether we believe in a policy of isolation or intervention, there can be no doubt that Congress should be speedily available for any possible emergency. To adjourn in the midst of crises which are the most serious in the history of our generation is a statement that Congress is not necessary at times of the deepest international concern. I, for one, believe that the Congress of the United States should remain in continuous session not only now but throughout the entire existence of the European war. We must prove that we are ready to act swiftly and effectively at every moment. We cannot do this if we must be recalled at the whim of the Nation's Chief Executive from distant points. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein certain editorial comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for the 10 minutes which I did not get yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert a few reports from newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INAUGURAL CELEBRATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I observe from the morning newspapers that they have released an important official from the State Department in order to handle the inaugural jubilee. I hope they will not forget the war or forget the national emergency or sacrifice any of our foreign policy or procedure in this matter. A lot of people are asking about

the cost of the inauguration of the third-term President. I do not know what it is going to be, but I am wondering whether it would not be a fine thing for Chief Justice Hughes to come over to the Capitol and swear in the President and give that \$100,000 or more that it will cost to the Red Cross and cut out the ballyhoo and glamour. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

MUGWUMP

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, in his speech yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] took occasion to refer to a candidate whom he called a mugwump. I would like to have the gentleman tell us what a mugwump is.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the voters have already told us that. There are so many definitions that are applicable that I would not want to burden the RECORD with them. At the same time I refer the gentleman from Missouri to an answer that came from Alabama sometime ago. If he will look at the RECORD, he will find a mugwump described as a bird that sits on a political fence with the "mug" on one side and the "wump" on the other. [Laughter and applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter by my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTINGER] to the President, and a letter from the President to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTINGER] on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts and statistics on the farm program in Texas and the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some excerpts from an editorial appearing in the Detroit News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a statement made by my colleague the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes following the address by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VULTEE AIRCRAFT FACTORY STRIKE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us here, as well as the people of America generally, have been grieved in recent days to read of the strike at the Vultee Aircraft Factory in California. For almost a week airplane building, on a defense order, has been at a standstill there. We would not set ourselves up as arbiters of the right in the controversy which exists between that company and its employees,

but we as elected Representatives of this Republic, as well as men and women throughout the land, are surely of the considered opinion that when a factory or a plant is engaged in the production of implements to go into the United States armament or rearmament program the differences between that company and its employees should be settled in conference and the necessary and vital production work should proceed. We need these planes—and labor, which has made great gains in the last few years has a responsibility to perform. I believe the discussions should go forward amicably of the points at issue without disruption of the plant operation itself.

I think this Congress, and those of us here who have been working for the best interests of organized and unorganized labor, should let those who precipitate such unwarranted procedure know that we look with strong disfavor on what is happening, not only at the Vultee plant but in several other factories throughout the United States. We must take steps to see it does not occur in other factories of the country. If these strikes do continue, we should take proper steps to see that such conditions are remedied by law if necessary. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am sorry, but my time has expired.

THE VOTE ON ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, just reviewing the vote on yesterday we saw that so many of our adjourners had already adjourned that it defeated adjournment. Now you Republican gentlemen and those of the Democrats who felt that we were safe in outvoting you, have my entire sympathy, but if you had just recorraled your forces and voted like you felt we should have been on our way home by now. Since we have decided to stay—I did not feel like sympathizing with you on yesterday, but after a night of good, sound sleep, and in the light of expressions of disappointment that have been made personally by so many of the antivoting adjourners who felt they would be safely outvoted, I say that since we are to stay here as a result of your action I am sure you have in mind a fine program, and since you have found work that is to be done we can now turn over many chips and do lots of stuff between now and real adjournment. Of course, we do not know what it is but we are only too glad to join in the labor. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

INVESTMENT BANKERS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have been informed that the investment bankers at their recent convention considered various matters pertaining to the subject of increasing their business and profits. No objection to that.

But since that time I have been receiving an ever-increasing number of letters from investment bankers and brokers urging the weakening of the Securities and Exchange Act under the pretense that it would permit small investors a greater opportunity to invest. The underlying purpose, I presume, is to give themselves and other stock manipulators the same leeway to rob the small investors that they enjoyed in 1927, 1928, and 1929. So the propaganda is on.

During the years mentioned, as the smaller investors still remember to their sorrow, the presses of the country were kept busy printing stock certificates that were not worth the cost of the paper upon which they were printed. These were shamelessly unloaded on the small investors who lost more than \$20,000,000,000 of their life savings.

We all recall that for the purpose of bringing about discord among the Democrats the Republican press and the Republican publicists for the past several years—in fact ever

since Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House—filled the newspapers of the country with charges that the Democratic Members of this body were mere "rubber-stamp" Congressmen, all the time knowing in their heart of hearts that these statements were wholly untrue.

But if there ever were "rubber-stamp Congressmen," we now have them on the Republican side. Yet we do not see a word in the newspapers about the Willkie "rubber stamps" who have been fighting almost as a unit on legislation before the Congress, and who, only yesterday, voted as one against adjournment. I presume Mr. Willkie, their late Power Trust candidate on the Republican ticket, desired to prevent adjournment in the hope of forcing through Congress legislation that will weaken or emasculate the Securities Exchange Act. Either that, or, even though the election is over, he is still playing cheap politics.

I was amazed at the vote yesterday on adjournment, when about 40 Democrats unthinkingly played into the hands of these conniving Republicans at the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Government. I wonder whether some Members realize there was an election recently at which the American people again expressed their complete confidence, and properly so, in the President by giving him a popular majority of over 4,000,000 votes, this despite the expenditure of millions of dollars by Wall Street and the Power Trust to elect their mouthpiece, Mr. Willkie, to the Presidency.

If the American people had known, as I did, of his 15-year record as servant for the utility and power companies, and of his atrocious lobbying activities in Washington to defeat the purposes of the Holding Company Act, as well as other beneficial legislation, President Roosevelt's majority would have been doubled.

Mr. Willkie a few days ago had the audacity to state he would continue to fight for his policies. What, may I ask him, are his policies? Is one of them to hamstring the Securities and Exchange Act to enable him and his coterie to mulct the small American investor of the savings made possible by the Democratic administration, and thus to repeat the drubbing they gave them in 1929?

It is to be regretted that these bankers, brokers, and industrial czars fail to realize the great benefits that accrued to them by reason of the New Deal, and that they continue to bite the hand that has and is continuing to feed them. Why do not they look back and contemplate what their lot was in 1931, 1932, and 1933?

But, thanks to the common sense and good judgment of the American people, the uncountable misrepresentations and lies that have been uttered and printed in the past 5 or 6 years, and especially during the last campaign—such, for instance, as the alleged violation of the Constitution, dictatorship, and other false issues, all launched for the purpose of arousing fear and discord—have availed the Republicans absolutely nothing. And they will not, no matter how many times repeated, avail you on the other side, because never before in the history of our country are conditions as favorable and promising as today. A boom that will smash all records lies ahead for American industry. Increased production, increased business, increased net earnings, increased employment, increased wages, and increased social security for the underprivileged is the true story of the accomplishments of the 7-year Roosevelt administration. But you will never see it emphasized in the editorial columns of the Republican press.

We are gradually but surely increasing the national income, and I am satisfied that it will reach the ninety billion mark in 1941 under this administration. Under the last year of the Hoover maladministration the national income was but forty billion. And we are daily bringing about reemployment as never before.

Instead of reading in the financial sections of the Republican press, as in 1932, of bankruptcies, foreclosures, and failures, I note in this morning's Washington (D. C.) Post:

That even Tom Girdler, of the Republic Steel, the severest critic of the President and the New Deal, sees a real boom for 1941. The Republic Steel financial report for the first 6 months of 1940 shows a \$6,000,000 greater profit than for the corresponding period of 1938.

That a \$67,000,000 Federal home-loan bank issue is far oversold at a record interest rate of one-fifth of 1 percent.

That Johns-Manville voted an increase in dividend; also, that the "Pennsy" nets \$22,718,397 in the first 9 months of this year, an increase of \$7,947,854 over last year.

That the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. declared a dividend of \$1 on its common stock.

That the Kennecott Copper Co. declared a special dividend.

That the directors of the International Business Machines Corporation declared a 5-percent capital-stock dividend and, in addition, a cash dividend of \$1.50.

In today's New York Times—November 20—I see such headlines as these; and were it not that it would be an abuse of your time, I could cite you hundreds of similar ones—all, mind you, from today's papers:

Building in 1941 to hit 10-year peak.

Electrical goods volume up 15.8 to 51.4 percent.

Cotton moves up to season's peak.

Thirteen grocery chains report increases.

And here is a quick break-down of the net profits of some of America's leading businesses for the first 6 months of 1933—Hoover "old deal"—with the first 6 months of 1940—Roosevelt New Deal—which tell their own uncontradictable story:

	Net profits for first 6 months, 1933	Net profits for first 6 months, 1940	Percent increase
General Electric.....	\$5,953,605	\$25,871,572	334
United Fruit.....	5,073,000	9,370,000	85
Republic Steel Co.....	2,929,019	6,449,453	120
Atlantic Refining Co.....	1,002,000	5,266,000	425
Libby-Owens-Ford Glass.....	2,157,083	5,176,748	140
Caterpillar Tractor.....	470,765	3,509,514	646
American Brake Shoe & Foundry Co.....	241,486	1,266,636	425
Beech Nut Packing Co.....	744,487	1,461,018	96
Kimberly-Clark Corporation.....	311,511	1,373,651	340
Container Corporation of America.....	240,177	1,128,735	369
Hanna (M. A.) Co.....	394,909	1,104,307	179
Eaton Manufacturing Co.....	31,253	1,908,348	6,054
Borg-Warner Corporation.....	335,172	2,830,983	747
General Cigar.....	441,058	574,068	30

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, instead of trying to harass and embarrass the administration and instilling fear in the minds of the people, would it not be more patriotic and statesmanlike for all frankly to point out the great progress that is being made in this country under President Roosevelt and the Democratic administration?

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

•The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Members who voted against adjournment yesterday. They tell us there is no legislation before Congress. I deny that statement.

There is pending before the Senate the bill (H. R. 9000), on which we in the Veterans' Committee worked for months to take care of the disabled dependents of World War veterans, many of whom died as a result of disabilities incurred in the World War. There are other reasons why we should not adjourn, but this one is sufficient; and I do not propose to vote to adjourn this Congress until that bill is brought out of the Senate committee and the Senate votes it up or votes it down. [Applause.]

We are drafting the youth of this land today. If we should be plunged into a war, are we going to say when the war is over and these young men come home to die, many of them without knowing their rights, without having an opportunity to make provision for their widows and orphans, that these widows and orphans shall be driven to the bread lines because the Congress of the United States refused to pass the necessary legislation? If we can put all these people on relief we can take care of the widows and orphans of those men who bared their breasts in the World War 23 years ago.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman think that those who voted for adjournment yesterday would vote for his bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; certainly, they did do it.

Mr. SABATH. Why did not the gentleman vote for it?

Mr. RANKIN. I did vote for it; the measure passed the House unanimously—there was not a dissenting vote. Of course, I voted for it; I am the author of it and am chairman of the committee that reported it, and I do not propose to vote for a final adjournment of this Congress until it is disposed of one way or the other.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], is recognized for 10 minutes.

RACKETEERING WITHOUT ADMINISTRATION DISAPPROVAL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's press carries the information that yesterday the President, asked to comment upon the adjournment of Congress, stated in substance that he had no further legislative program to submit to us.

From this statement we may draw the conclusion that the President is now satisfied that there is nothing more that the Congress can do to aid in national defense, to assist in solving our domestic problems, or in meeting the emergency which he declared to exist because of the World War.

The election is over. For 2 years at least we may lay aside purely partisan political discussion. We may now, without being subjected to the charge that our motives are partisan, our aims political, venture to point out where in the administration's program is incomplete, offers no safeguard against a prophesied and anticipated danger, and to suggest corrective measures.

We voted yesterday against sine die adjournment. Notwithstanding the statement of the President that he knows of no further legislation which needs our consideration at this time, notwithstanding the statement of the House leadership that it has no program of legislation to offer, there is corrective legislation which should be adopted.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Permit me to call the attention of the House and of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that the President last May said there was no occasion for Congress to remain in session, yet we found ourselves woefully lacking in defense machinery and since then voted about \$14,000,000,000 for defense purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is not the first nor the only time the President has found himself in need of appropriations from Congress. After all, Congress has at times been a convenience to the President, a sort of, at times, useful appendage, to be used when money was needed.

Permit me to call the attention of the House—which has refused to adjourn and which intends to remain here, I understand, until the beginning of the year—to the fact that there is plenty for us to do. There is much unfinished and necessary business confronting us. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] just stated, there is veterans' legislation pending before another body that has not been disposed of. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has referred to a situation which we should not permit to pass unnoticed, and to which it is my purpose to direct my remarks. There is no reason why we should continue to permit this unlawful procedure to exist. I wish that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], a member of the Labor Committee, would bring the situation before that committee, because, after all, the Democratic Party is responsible now for the things that are being done. It is responsible for the failure to provide the remedy. It is up to the Democrats, the party in control, to bring out proper legislation, because they throw all our proposed legislation into the wastebasket.

Laying aside domestic problems, let us consider the immediate situation which confronts us. The country and this Congress have been told by this administration that our institutions, our Government, our very existence, were being threatened by foreign invasion.

Whipped to hysteria by the spokesmen of the administration, the country demanded, and the Congress appropriated, billions of dollars for national defense. The Congress passed and the President signed in peacetime a conscription bill which will place at his disposal an army of more than a million men.

The President having given us to understand that he had nothing more for the Congress to do, we, as Representatives of the people, should now once more assume the duties which the Constitution lays upon us, perform the service for which our constituents elect and pay us.

Notwithstanding the grants of unlimited power and the appropriation of billions of dollars for national defense, the sad fact remains that boring from within are forces which will utterly destroy the effectiveness of all of our efforts unless this Congress takes action.

The President and the Democratic Party at the election on November 5 were charged with the protection of our country during the next 4 years. Upon the shoulders of this administration, upon the Democratic Party, rests the grave responsibility of seeing to it not only that we are protected from all foreign danger but that the money of the taxpayers is wisely and economically spent; that the liberties guaranteed us by our Constitution are not, under the guise of preparedness, taken from our people.

On the floor of this House on the 24th day of September last—and I notice that the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is here today, as he was here on that occasion—I charged this administration with the failure to protect American citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights. More specifically, I charged that this administration denied to patriotic American citizens the right to work on the national-defense program without paying tribute to racketeers.

On the same occasion it was charged by me that this administration permitted racketeers, openly and without authority of law, to levy tribute upon law abiding, patriotic American citizens.

On the same occasion the majority party was challenged to dispute the evidence which I adduced in support of that charge. By the end of this week 60 days will have passed since that challenge was issued and so far no man has arisen to answer that challenge.

Today I repeat the charge that this administration is deliberately following a course permitting abuses, which outrageously increases the cost of the national-defense program, which wastes the taxpayer's money. I deliberately make the charge, based upon the facts referred to on the floor on September 24 and upon other evidence which is available, that this administration, conniving with racketeers, is permitting the collection, through extortion, of thousands of dollars from the American workingmen.

I charged on that occasion, and I charge again here today, that the Democratic Party, although it professes to be the friend of the man who toils, is permitting that man to be exploited; is permitting money to be taken from him unlawfully, illegally, and I ask the Democratic floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to refute the charges I made on the 24th of September and that I am making now. Those charges are contained in the RECORD and I have again restated them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is the greatest Member of the House for indicting innocent people and innocent administrations than anybody I ever met in my lifetime.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There you have the gentleman's answer—words, but no proof. A counter charge against me, but no answer to the charges which I make.

The charges which are made by me are a charge against this administration and against the majority party, and it is no answer to say that those charges are indictments of innocent people.

It may be true that the pot should not call the kettle black, but to reply that the pot is black is no proof that the kettle is white.

I put in the RECORD letters and statements showing that at Fort Custer, under this administration, men who wanted to work on the national-defense program were denied that constitutional right until they came across and paid tribute to a labor union.

Your answer is that I am making charges that have not been substantiated. I submitted the proof. A part of it is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of September 24. Other evidence has been offered from the floor of the House by Members of the House. Much other evidence is available.

In today's issue of the Evening Star is a story by Robert Bruskin, reporter for the Star, who states in substance that he went to Fort Meade, Md., and, although he had no experience as a carpenter, obtained a job at \$75 a week as a carpenter; that to obtain the job he made an agreement to pay \$57.50 to a union.

The story is an interesting one and should be read by every Member of the House, for it shows from an unbiased source a little of what is happening throughout the country.

I challenge the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], as the majority leader, to pass House Resolution 612, which I offered on the 24th day of September, and which calls for the appointment of a nonpartisan committee to investigate the charges which I made, to make a report to the House, and to suggest such legislation as will remedy the situation. Such an investigation, if honestly conducted, will determine whether I have indicted innocent people or whether the majority party and this administration is sheltering, aiding, abetting extortionists, labor racketeers, who are preying upon the man who works.

This administration claims that it is the friend of the laboring man. I charge that it permits the laboring man to be exploited by and for the benefit of political labor organizers and racketeers.

I charge that it has forgotten the rank and file of labor; that it has supported, and that it now gives its support to, those who exploit labor and who levy tribute upon the laboring man.

Upon the doorstep of the Democratic Party I here and now lay the charge that into its political bed have crawled the slimy, politically minded labor racketeers, who not only are wasting the taxpayers' money, delaying and hindering adequate national defense, but levying tribute upon the workingman himself; and this administration not only gives them protection, permits them to practice their unlawful extortion, but apparently welcomes them.

This administration, notwithstanding its profession of concern for the interests of the man who toils, is by its conduct giving active aid to those who are forging the shackles of slavery upon the arms of the man who must work for his livelihood.

I again, as I did on September 24, challenge the Democratic Party to deny the charge that it is permitting the exploitation of American workmen; that it is permitting the national-defense program to be hindered and delayed; that it is permitting the American taxpayer to be robbed through excessive cost.

How do you justify that kind of illegal, unlawful extortion, the levying of tribute upon American workers? How do you justify it? You dare not go before the Labor Committee over there and introduce legislation to prevent it and as long as you refuse to do that how can you hold up your heads and say that you favor the American worker? The thing you as a party condone, is a system whereby these organizers, political men in labor organizations, advance their own interest by the collecting of tribute from the man who toils and at the same time hold up the defense program.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. I take it for granted, according to the gentleman's statement now, that he is a great friend of labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am a friend of the man who works.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. The gentleman has been protesting all along against labor trying to get higher wages.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not understand. That statement is not correct. I am for the man who works, not for the man who collects from the workingmen, not for the labor racketeers. I am against the men, such as Scalise and Bioff, that Westbrook Pegler has been writing about. I am for the man who actually does the work and I challenge

the majority party to bring out legislation to protect that man against those who are levying tribute upon him now when he asks the privilege and the right of going to Fort Custer and working there.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has made mention of comment that I made earlier in the afternoon relative to the strike at Vultee Aircraft Factory. I want to simply follow up his statement by saying that I believe the American people are properly incensed at the attitude of certain strike methods which are going on, not only in the Vultee factory but in many other factories of this country engaged in production of defense materials.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All over the country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. As one member of the Labor Committee, I believe that our committee itself should discuss the situation and perhaps through some legislative proposal attempt to solve a very serious problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield? We might bring out something very good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat for the benefit of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who is a representative of labor, that there is no question about the charges which I made, and which I today renew. They have been made on the floor of the House. They have been made publicly. Proof has been offered. If untrue, my conduct is reprehensible; if true, a speedy and drastic remedy should be afforded. The duty to present that remedy or to give the minority an opportunity to present it rests upon the administration, even though the President says he has no legislative program to submit, even though the House leadership says it has no legislative program. The administration, the Democratic Party, cannot shirk its responsibility for this most vicious situation, which endangers our national defense, by replying that the maker of the charge indicts innocent people.

If they are not true, why do you not appoint a committee, let it investigate the situation and give us the evidence on the situation and disprove the charges and the evidence I offered on the 24th of September? Let us have facts instead of words. I will put in one side and you put in the other.

I challenge the Democratic Party to adopt House Resolution 612, calling for the appointment of a special committee to determine whether or not American citizens are being denied employment; whether they are being charged unlawfully for the right to work on our defense program; in short, whether American citizens, patriotic and law-abiding, are being denied their rights under the Constitution.

I challenge the Democratic Party, which has an overwhelming majority in House and Senate, to remain here in Washington on the job, to force the attendance of a quorum each day, to take up and dispose of the Smith amendments to the Wagner law, consideration of the Walter-Logan bill, the appointment of committees to collect and give to the people from official sources information in answer to the charges which I have today made.

That there may be no doubt as to what those charges are, let me here repeat them. This administration is charged: First. With wasting the taxpayers' money on the defense program.

Second. With permitting activities which hinder and delay that program.

Third. With permitting the exploitation of, and extortion from, the American laboring man. [Applause.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present. Let us have some business or else adjourn, and I serve notice now that we are going to have a quorum call every time I am on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will

count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-five Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. DINGELL moved a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 235]

Allen, La.	Eaton	Knutson	Rich
Allen, Pa.	Edelstein	Kunkel	Risk
Andrews	Edmiston	Larrabee	Routzohn
Angell	Evans	Leavy	Ryan
Austin	Faddis	LeCompte	Sacks
Barton, N. Y.	Fay	Lemke	Sandager
Bates, Ky.	Ferguson	Luce	Sasser
Bell	Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Satterfield
Bland	Flannery	McAndrews	Schaefer, Ill.
Brewster	Ford, Leland M.	McArdle	Schaefer, Wis.
Brooks	Ford, Thomas F.	McDowell	Schaffer
Buckler, Minn.	Fries	McGranery	Schuetz
Buckley, N. Y.	Gartner	McKeough	Secombe
Bulwinkle	Geyer, Calif.	McLaughlin	Shafer, Mich.
Byrne, N. Y.	Gibbs	McLeod	Smith, Ill.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gilchrist	Maciejewski	Smith, Wash.
Byron	Green	Magnuson	Smith, W. Va.
Caldwell	Gwynne	Mansfield	Snyder
Cannon, Fla.	Hall, Edwin A.	Marshall	Somers, N. Y.
Celler	Harness	May	South
Chapman	Harrington	Monkiewicz	Sparkman
Cluett	Harter, Ohio	Mott	Stagall
Coffee, Nebr.	Hennings	Mouton	Stearns, N. H.
Coffee, Wash.	Hook	Mundt	Sullivan
Cole, Md.	Horton	Murdock, Utah	Sutphin
Colmer	Houston	Myers	Sweeney
Connery	Hunter	Nelson	Thomason
Costello	Izac	Nichols	Thorkelson
Courtney	Jeffries	Norrell	Vincent, Ky.
Creal	Jenks, N. H.	Norton	Vinson, Ga.
Crosser	Johns	O'Brien	Wallgren
Crowe	Johnson, W. Va.	O'Connor	Weatherford
Cummings	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Day	Welch
Darrow	Kefauver	O'Leary	West
Davis	Keller	Osmer	White, Idaho
Delaney	Kennedy, Michael	O'Toole	White, Ohio
Dempsey	Keogh	Pfeifer	Wolcott
DeRouen	Kilburn	Pierce	Wood
Dies	Kirwan	Reece, Tenn.	
Dworshak	Kieberg	Reed, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventy-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in order that there may be no misunderstanding—and I am expressing my own views—the President has never said that there was no legislation for Congress to pass upon, but he did say that he had no further recommendations to make. That is the statement made by the President, and there should not be any misunderstanding about it.

As far as I am aware—and I believe this statement should be made for the benefit of the Members—I know of no legislative program at the present time. There is certainly none for Friday and I know of none for Monday. As far as I am concerned, and I know this is the attitude of the leadership on both sides, in view of the situation that confronts us we have to view it practically, and certainly, if there is no legislation to come up, every effort will be made by the leadership to cooperate with the Members in meeting their own individual problems. I know now of no legislation that is coming up. There is none coming up Friday and there is none coming up Monday. I know of none in the future. I will bring nothing up—controversial on Friday or Monday without the assent of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The President has said that he has no further recommendation to make at this time. That is an entirely different

proposition than saying that there is no further legislation for Congress to pass upon. I think the record should be clear.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just to explain the difference between his two statements?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not believe there is any necessity for my explaining the difference. Every Member but the gentleman from Michigan himself sees a distinction. I am making this statement not for controversy but to try to help the Members on both sides. If any legislation does come up the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], or in his absence anyone representing the minority party, will be advised and, as far as I am concerned, the Democratic Members will be advised. I know of no legislation now that is coming up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not want the gentleman to think there is any likelihood of my being absent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no; of course, the gentleman is aware of the fact that if he were absent I would consult whoever is the acting leader of the minority party.

I make this statement on my own initiative so that Members may govern themselves accordingly. I believe I speak the view of the Speaker, but the statement is made on my own initiative.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GOVERNMENT BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think I should first announce myself so that there may be no misunderstanding. In English parlance, I am a member of "His Majesty's loyal opposition." I trust I shall be more loyal in that opposition than ever before, and I am convinced after yesterday that I shall be supplemented by many of the Democratic Party of this House.

The little girl went to the grocer and said, "Mother would like a quart of good-natured alcohol." What I say will be good-natured, although it will perhaps appear a little strong, and some may not like it. Unity is demanded. Unity for what? We had a remarkable instance of unity in the solid South lately, where the old slogan seems yet to prevail "that any Democrat is better than any Republican." But on the vote yesterday anything but unity was shown. Distrust was shown. It was a remarkable exhibition of distrust; I cannot see where unity is coming from. If we hold together on this side as a minority, do not blame us. In other nations the majority would have resigned on yesterday after that vote.

I understood the gentleman from Michigan was to talk today about something that I ought to follow up. I want the leader of the Democratic Party from Boston to sympathize and listen to me. I live within 7 miles of a camp where 12,000 people are at work. Referring to this picture in my hand appearing in the press this morning, this boy declared that he could get a job at Camp Meade without any experience if he would pay the union dues. I have had to watch thousands of my neighbors and others pay \$75, or promise to pay it, to get a job on national defense which was supposed to last only 75 days. I have a great number of calls at my home office from men looking for jobs or to be reinstated, and many complaints of other sorts, and now the newspapers are clamoring and demanding of me that I ask for investigations.

Investigations of what? The firm employed there to carry out this work is doing the best it can. It is a very reliable firm and they are acting under Government instructions on a cost-plus basis. They must get it done in 75 days. It was estimated to cost \$7,500,000, but this week it is said it will cost \$15,000,000. But that is, of course, to be expected.

Shall I investigate the unions that have the complete and full backing of your Government? A little union is getting

thousands of new members at \$75. What a remarkable treasury created overnight! What will they do with it? The contractor is not to blame. He must recognize unions, and the largest unit. So everybody had to join and I was forced to advise them to join in order to get a job. It was promised that the nearby people would have preference. They have apparently tried to show this preference, but it is most difficult in its working out.

Now, what shall we investigate? The cost, the contractor, the union, which you do not dare to investigate and which you would not investigate, of course. They are probably within their legal rights, but I want to say to you that this is a splendid example of waste and extravagance and the rousing of our people to a war hysteria in order to carry an election. I hope it will now die down. Shall we inquire why the New England hurricane lumber was not used on these jobs?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask how many men are employed, so far as he knows, at the construction camp at Falmouth, in the gentleman's district?

Mr. GIFFORD. The maximum was about 12,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Are they all obliged to put up that fee?

Mr. GIFFORD. Absolutely, laborers as well as mechanics, must join a union. They cannot go to work unless they buy their union card.

Mr. TREADWAY. How expensive are those cards?

Mr. GIFFORD. Seventy-five dollars for carpenters. It is only \$45 at Fort Meade or \$57.50, I think, at Fort Custer, but ours is \$75. They take it out of their wages every week.

Mr. TREADWAY. And at the same time those men who are paying the \$75 are actually being employed to construct buildings for the Federal Government?

Mr. GIFFORD. Absolutely, and on a national-defense job. How wonderful? Now, the newspapers are demanding of me that I make investigations. Investigations of what? They say there is a lot of job selling going on. I do not know anything about that. They must prove this to me before I can take it up. But where can I speak except here?

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the gentleman further whether evidence from a constituent of mine that he has been held up for \$75 would be of any value to him?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no; because they are all held up. I was there, surrounded by some 500 men, angry men, and I had to simply tell them, "You must join, or you will not get a job," and I felt humiliated in the extreme, because it was my Government on a national-defense job.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I notice the gentleman has there an article from today's Star. What experience did that man have to get a job?

Mr. GIFFORD. He did not have any, and he did not need any, he says, and my men did not need any, and they were kept at work for some weeks, and much of the union fees were paid.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us what is the hourly wage that is being paid?

Mr. GIFFORD. One dollar and seventeen cents; although 80 cents seems to have been the local rate. Why pay \$1.17? Why all this hurry? The buildings in which to make the guns are not yet erected. Why this haste?

I believe in national defense as much as any of you, of course, and we voted the money, but we want orderly processes and no wasteful extravagances. Why did they create this hysteria? There was a sound truck for days before the election going over that area booming, perhaps not in the exact words but to the effect, "You owe this job to Roosevelt; you know for whom you ought to vote." What comment have you on that?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the gentleman, in view of the fact that this cantonment under construction is in his district, whether he has called this situation to the attention of the commanding officer at that point?

Mr. GIFFORD. The commanding officer has nothing to do with construction, but I have talked with the contractor many times over these conditions. At the moment I have no complaint against this contractor. He is the right man to get a job done in a hurry. But why such hurry? The Government practically says, "We want you to do the job quickly, and expense is quite secondary."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Who has the authority to supervise these workmen?

Mr. GIFFORD. I sent a message hurriedly to Washington to investigate that union matter, and they later made acknowledgment and said they had looked into it, but nothing came of it. This administration will not do a thing about these unions. You Democratic majority do not dare to do a thing about them.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The complaint comes to me from some of my constituents who have worked on the job about the incompetency of the supervisory board because they do not demand and require a fair day's work.

Mr. GIFFORD. Why should they?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Well, of course, that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Who tells the contractor that he shall not employ anybody unless he shows a union card?

Mr. GIFFORD. Why, that is the law, practically. I was told by the contractor that the union men would be exhausted in a very short time, and he said, "I will then put all other men to work." But the union saw to it that they supplied the men as fast as needed. Men appeared from great distances with cards or willingly bought cards. They apparently would not let a man work if he had not joined some union. The contractor himself did not understand that the thing would work out that way. Again I say I do not blame the contractor. I blame this hasty action, this hysteria that they intended to inculcate for purposes you well know.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I want to understand thoroughly about this, because I know the people of my district are interested in understanding it. As I understand the gentleman's proposition, where the going wage is 85 cents, these unskilled workmen, without experience, are offered \$1.17, provided they can show a union card.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. Why did they do it? The union said, "You are getting such a raise above your ordinary 80 cents an hour that you can afford to join the union and pay it to us." But after these carpenters had paid their union dues, in many cases they were called in and fired from the union because they were not really carpenters; but the union had the money.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Are these contracts being secured from the Government on a cost-plus basis?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So that in effect the unions are now in a position to say that Uncle Sam will pay the bill by paying this extra higher rate so that these men can pay for their union cards?

Mr. GIFFORD. That is the way it worked out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. There are many larger issues facing us which I desired to discuss. I have here a letter from one of the largest reporting agencies in this country; one of the most reliable and probably as large and as important as Babson, and which letter is sent out to their customers over the entire

country. The quotations are simply frightening. The writer closed by saying, "My face is not red; it is pale." In effect he said: "Old people have not been able to work their money lately to get any interest. I now recognize that they will lose their money." I may see fit, if I get permission from the author, to put this entire letter in the Record, because it is from one of the most persuasive reporting agencies that we know.

I may say I have tried to be a student of the public-debt effects for many years, and I would like to make three suggestions: One, to meet this huge defense expense, tax all you dare. Secondly, borrow of private people; and, lastly, use commercial banks just as little as you can. Every bond issued by a commercial bank doubles the deposits in the bank. We have \$69,000,000,000 on deposit. We have \$8,000,000,000 in circulation, and the seeds of inflation are firmly planted. It may be we can prevent it; but let us not create more of that kind of money. Let us sell those bonds to individuals like you did in the World War. Sell them for a longer period of time. If you do not, I join with this reporting agency and say something dreadful is to happen in this country. It is too awfully plain. Can you not see it?

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman feel that these bonds he recommends selling to the individual should be tax-exempt?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have always believed it. You Democrats talked in favor, but you voted against it. Even in 1922 you did that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Not me.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not know about the gentleman personally, but when the vote was finally taken in 1922, what a dreadful exposition it was. As long as your Government is in the market to borrow money for these defense bonds, you do not dare vote taxed bonds.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will dare.

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, the gentleman dared yesterday. He often displays courage. He is to have a lot of invitations from me again that he make investigations in his Committee on Expenditures, such as I have outlined this morning. I hope his courage will stick with him. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have inserted in the Record an Associated Press dispatch wherein it is asserted that the British Ambassador demanded American men to fight English battles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a few observations from newspapers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE CAPITOL ROOF

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the Well of the House today to talk to the membership about the condition of the roof over this Chamber. I was the Member appointed by the Speaker on behalf of the House to act with Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, appointed by the Vice President on the part of the Senate, as a committee to make a study of the roofs over the House and Senate Chambers. The matter was brought to the attention of the legislative subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee by the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. David Lynn.

This roof has been inspected by consulting engineers. A very thorough report has been made by the widely known consulting engineer, Thomas W. Marshall, of Washington, D. C. William R. Osgood, materials engineer, National Bureau of Standards, has investigated the roof; so has A. E. Falconer, structural engineer of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department; so has C. G. Palmer, architectural engineer of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department; and P. A. Randall, architectural engineer of the Procurement Division. Then on top of all this investigation, all of the engineers telling us that the roof is in a very dangerous condition; the trusses being 86 years old, made of cast iron and wrought iron, and pin connected, which pins actually show bending, are deficient in strength, and no one can tell whether or not the pins are cracked, and further there is hanging from that roof construction the ceiling of this Chamber which weighs 120 tons. After further study the joint committee employed a special engineer to check the existing conditions and a special appropriation was granted for the purpose. He was the well-known Herman F. Doelman, consulting engineering of Baltimore, Md. He stated that the roof was in worse condition than any of the other engineers had testified previously. Then we called in F. H. Franklin, chief engineer of the American Institute of Steel Construction, Inc., of New York City. He corroborated everything that had been said by the foregoing engineers.

I think it is very necessary that something be done about this roof. It is going to be necessary to shore up this ceiling in here which is made of cast iron and is estimated to weigh 120 tons. This ceiling is not plaster, it is a cast iron ceiling that hangs suspended from the roof trusses. It was put up 86 years ago. Trusses must be installed under this cast iron ceiling supported by steel columns erected upon the masonry walls at the front of the galleries. This construction will support the cast iron ceiling until we can get to this roof after the end of the next session.

Something ought to be done by the membership of this House. If they have no respect for themselves about the condition, they at least ought to have some respect for their guests who sit in these galleries.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. How about using the caucus room in the House Office Building from now on?

Mr. RABAUT. I do not care where they move to, but it is not a very sensible idea to be coming into this room with this actually dangerous condition existing, dangerous as testified to by everybody who has been asked to tell us about it. From the Bureau of Yards and Docks and the National Bureau of Standards to special engineers, the testimony of each of them is that this roof is in a dangerous condition.

The subcommittee of deficiency on appropriations has seen fit, after this study and the plea of the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. David Lynn, to grant a suitable appropriation for this most necessary reconstruction. It certainly seems proper for this body to relieve the responsibility that has been placed upon a faithful public servant, the Honorable David Lynn, the Architect of the Capitol, and take the necessary action to vacate this room for the purpose of allowing the necessary repairs to be made for the safety of the Chamber that houses the Congress of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MRS. GEORGE C. HAMILTON ET AL.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4561) for the relief of Mrs. George C. Hamilton and Nanette Anderson, and ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4561)

entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. George C. Hamilton and Nanette Anderson" having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Jr.,
PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4561), for the relief of Mrs. George C. Hamilton and Nanette Anderson, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House passed this bill to provide the sum of \$250 to Mrs. George C. Hamilton, and the sum of \$1,000 to Nanette Anderson. The Senate passed this bill with an amendment reducing the amount provided for Nanette Anderson to \$500.

At the conference the Senate receded from its amendment.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. SATTERFIELD (at the request of Mr. BURCH), indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, if the statement of the gentleman from Michigan is correct regarding the condition of this roof, then certainly we are derelict in our duty in failing to take cognizance of his statement and the expert advice of engineers. We are reasonable men and women here and certainly we ought to consider ourselves, our families, and our guests and do something about moving this body into another meeting place until the roof is repaired. I cannot, for the life of me, see any sense in continuing here when expert advice indicates that the contrary is desirable. I hope the Members of the House will have the good sense to do the thing recommended by the gentleman from Michigan.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other business in order for the day I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I observe that the interest, the safety, and security of the Nation is lagging, therefore, I raise the point of no quorum.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, November 22, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2029. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to remove certain limitations on appropriations for the pay of midshipmen, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 10694. A bill for the relief of Gil Augusto Correai; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 10695. A bill for the relief of Marie Valida Antonia Michaud; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1940

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 19, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God most high, whose Spirit searcheth all things, whose love endureth all things: Draw us near to Thee in sincerity and truth, and save us from mere worship of the lips while our hearts are far from Thee. As we have grown unconscious of our need and accustomed to things remaining as they are, as we have lost our vision and have found ourselves unwilling to pay the price of better things, do Thou stand before us like the light and reveal to us the dawning sense of brotherhood.

Make us to love Thy will and sweep away our fears, our compromise with evil. As we realize our hunger after righteousness, teach us, as a Nation, that the way of prayer and penitence is the only way that is safe for us and sure to lead us unto Thee, where true and lasting peace alone is to be found. In our Saviour's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, November 19, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I send forward the credentials of Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Senator-elect from Illinois, and ask that they be read and placed on file.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read.

The credentials of C. WAYLAND BROOKS, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ending January 3, 1943, caused by the death of the late Senator James Hamilton Lewis, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator-elect is present and prepared to take the oath.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish simply to state that I have been informed informally that there may be some question raised with respect to this matter, in which event, of course, the Senate would not waive any of its rights with respect to the election by having Mr. Brooks take the oath of office, as I understand. So, under the circumstances, I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator-elect will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered.

Mr. BROOKS, escorted by Mr. VANDENBERG, advanced to the desk; and the oath of office having been administered to him by the President pro tempore, he took his seat in the Senate.